



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,855	04/04/2001	Ching-Yu Chang	4425-130	9977

7590 05/20/2003

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

CULBERT, ROBERTS P

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/824,855	CHANG, CHING-YU
Examiner	Art Unit	
Roberts Culbert	1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to the amendment filed 4/29/03. The rejection of claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112 was in error and has been withdrawn. The indicated allowability of claims 17 and 18 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s). Claims 1-10 and 19-28 are cancelled. Claims 11-18 are in the case.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11, 12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,340,437 to Erk in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30, Issue 6, Page 244.

Erk discloses a method for etching semiconductor wafers that includes the steps of immersing the wafers in an etchant solution and forming bubbles by pressurizing the solution (Fig. 1; Col. 3, Lines 20-30). The preferred etchant solution contains nitric acid and hydrochloric acid (Col. 4, Line 1). It is clear that some bubbles are located on the surface of the wafer to be etched because the bubbles are distributed upwards toward the wafer (Col. 8, Lines 5-12). The etched wafers have surface roughness from 0.06 to 0.09 micrometers (Col. 8, Lines 60-61).

Erk does not disclose the formation of a photoresist on the wafer surface. However, Official Notice is taken that the formation of a photoresist on a wafer is notoriously old and well known in the semiconductor fabrication art for the purpose of selectively processing a substrate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply a photoresist to the wafer in order to selectively process the surface and form a semiconductor device in the well-known manner.

Art Unit: 1763

Erk does not teach performing a dry process before application of a photoresist to the wafer.

However, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30, Issue 6, Page 244 teaches that it is known to use a dry process before application of a photoresist to a wafer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the dry process suggested in order to improve the adhesion of the photoresist and remove remaining solution from the wafer surface in the well-known manner.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,340,437 to Erk in view of U.S. Patent 4,980,300 to Miyashita and IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30, Issue 6, Page 244.

As applied above, U.S. Patent 5,340,437 to Erk in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30, Issue 6, Page 244 discloses the method of invention substantially as claimed, but does not show the use of a gas supply to form the bubbles in the solution.

Miyashita teaches a method for treating a wafer with bubbles that includes formation of bubbles using a gas supply tube (Col. 2, Line 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a separate gas supply in order to avoid the steps of dissolving the gas in the etchant and pressurizing the etchant solution.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,340,437 to Erk in view of U.S. Patent 6,087,240 to Gilchrist.

Referring to Figure 6, Gilchrist teaches a method for forming a capacitor including the steps of providing a substrate (32), forming a first dielectric layer (36), forming a hole (38) in first dielectric layer such that part of the substrate is exposed, forming a first conductor layer (34) in the hole (38), forming a second conductor layer (40) on both the first dielectric and first conductor layers, and forming a second dielectric layer (44) and a third conductor layer (46) on the second conductor layer (40).

Gilchrist does not teach the step of immersing the substrate in a solution with bubbles to roughen the surface.

Art Unit: 1763

Gilchrist does teach that the conductor layers are formed from conductive polysilicon (Col. 1, Lines 44-46). Gilchrist also teaches that it is recognized in the prior art that the capacitance of a polysilicon layer may be increased by increasing the surface roughness (Col. 1, Lines 57-60).

Erk teaches a method for providing a silicon layer with a micro-roughness from 0.06 to 0.09 micrometers (Col. 8, line 60) by contacting the surface with a solution containing bubbles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to increase the surface roughness of the conductor layers in the capacitor by contacting the layer with a solution containing bubbles as in the method of Erk, in order to increase the surface roughness and capacitance.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kim and Advocate Jr. teach methods for forming bubbles in solution to treat a substrate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (703) 305-7965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

May 15, 2003


GREGORY MILLS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700